India

FOR THE

No. 92. New Series.
No. 186. Old Series.

WEEK ENDING FRIDAY, OCTOBER 6, 1899.

Registered as a Newspaper. Price...... 2d. By Post, 2½d.

Notes and News 165
The Calcutta Municipal Bill 168
The Lessons of the Rangoon Outrage 169
Village Communities in India... ... 170
The People of India: Their many merits by many who have known them 171
The Punjab Land Alienation Bill... 172
Calcutta Municipal Bill: Telegram 173
The Telegraphic Press Messages Bill 173
Notes from Bombay 173
The Rangoon Outrage: Trial of Johnson 174
The Sugar Bounties and Countervailing Duties 174
"Soldiers and Natives" 175
The Chitral Reliefs 175
Lord Sandhurst's Successor 175
Judicial and Executive Functions... 175
Advertisements 176

NOTES AND NEWS.

It is seldom that a week passes without bringing the news of an assault committed on an Indian by a European. The *Civil and Military Gazette*, which it is scarcely necessary to say is an Anglo-Indian paper, informs us that Private O'Gara of the Royal Scots Fusiliers has been committed by the Cantonment Magistrate to take his trial before the Chief Court at Lahore for the wilful murder of a punkha-coolie on August 24. His Sergeant-Major has been arrested for not reporting the occurrence. The Peshawar correspondent of the *Gazette* goes on:—

> Over the two punkha-coolies killed, the O. C. of the regiment has prohibited all Natives from entering the regimental lines, with the result that the men do their own cooking and are responsible for the cleanness of their barracks.

This seems an excellent method of bringing home to the soldiers the evils of ill-treating Indians, and one worthy of imitation. But the *Tribune*, in quoting the above extract, is naturally staggered at the one murdered punkha-coolie growing into two. The whole matter might have remained unknown but for this casual mention in the *Gazette* some time after its occurrence, which lends colour to the contention that many assaults on Indians are never heard of in the Press. It is to be hoped that the mystery which seems still to enshroud the case will soon be cleared up.

The Indian contingent for South Africa was despatched with much promptitude. The orders went forth on September 9, and the last transport of the fleet sailed on the 28th. The cavalry brigade is drawn from the Punjab, Bengal, and Madras, and consists of the 5th (Princess Charlotte of Wales's) Dragoon Guards from Sialkot, the 9th Lancers from Muttra, and the 19th Hussars, originally the East India Company's European Cavalry, commonly known as "Dumpies." The infantry brigade includes the 1st Devonshire, the 1st Gloucestershire, the 2nd King's Royal Rifles, and the 2nd Gordon Highlanders (the old 92nd). Bombay is drawn upon for two of the three batteries of field artillery, the 42nd from Ahmadabad, and the 53rd from Deesa; the third, the 51st, comes from Madras (Secunderabad). By the time we go to press the major portion of the contingent has already arrived at Durban.

Reuter's agent at Simla telegraphed (September 22) that "the cost of the landing of the Indian contingent in Africa is estimated at about £400,000." However this may be, the bill is certain to be a very heavy one, and largely over the estimate. We must take it that in any case it will not be presented to India for payment. The Imperial Government must charge itself not only with the excess expenditure on the Indian troops during the period of their employment on African service, but also the ordinary expenditure; that is, the whole expenditure from the moment of their embarkation for Africa to the moment of their debarkation again in India. On that point there will probably be no contest. But we go farther. We contend that the employment of these troops at a chance moment and for an indefinite period thousands of miles across seas shows clearly that they are in no sense necessary to India, and that, therefore, the expense of keeping them in India ought never to fall upon the Indian Treasury. A British reserve, stationed for Imperial convenience in India, should obviously be paid for by the British Government. This practical consideration will not be allowed to pass out of sight.

We have not heard the last of rifle-thieves, of whose ubiquity and versatility, as the *Pioneer* says, we are continually receiving new proofs. This time Calcutta was the scene of their exploits. A well-known firm of gunmakers, Messrs. Rodda, received a consignment of seventy-eight guns and six revolvers which passed from ship-board into the custom-house on September 1; but when it was cleared on the 6th, it was found that the revolvers had been stolen. Our contemporary asks:—

> What is the meaning of this insatiable thirst for arms all over the country which seems to prompt more daring robberies than the thirst for gold?

And it even has visions of a gigantic conspiracy reaching from the frontier to the metropolis.

Indeed this theft at Calcutta does not stand alone, for another has lately been reported from the frontier, where it was said a short time ago that a rifle had been stolen from a sepoy of the 2nd Sikhs. This is gravely denied by the *Times of India*, but the denial is probably unique in the history of journalism. We are told that it is not correct that a rifle was stolen from a sepoy of the 2nd Sikhs; for the man lost his life. An advance scout of a water picquet being some twenty yards ahead was shot from an ambuscade, four Waziris making off with his rifle. So it seems that, even according to our contemporary's account, the rifle was stolen after all.

A correspondence that has reached us from Bombay throws a strange light upon the vagaries of well-intentioned plague officers. It consists of a series of letters between the Hon. Pherozeshah M. Mehta and Major Collie, the Plague Superintendent at Matheran, in May and June this year, with a few others of earlier date from Major Collie to some other distinguished Bombay citizens, including Mr. Justice Budrudin Tyabji and Mr. J. N. Tata. Major Collie was stationed to guard Malabar Hill against plague, and he would make no exception to the rule: "Either attend the office daily or be visited at your residences on alternate days and pay the fee for doing so," the fee being Rs. 50. That is to say, no exception *to Indians*, of whatever standing; but full exception to Europeans, and in many cases to their servants. Towards the end of May Mr. Mehta took the matter up, and on July 4 he submitted the correspondence to Government. On August 31, Mr. A. G. Woodburn, the Plague Commissioner of the Presidency, replied "that Government greatly regret that visitors have been put to so much inconvenience, and that orders are being issued, which, it is hoped, will prevent the occurrence of such inconvenience in future." Mr. Mehta is to be congratulated on making a successful stand against a system that ought never to have been set up at all. When will officials learn to save everybody indefinite trouble and vexation by the simple process of treating their Indian fellow-subjects precisely as they treat their European fellow-subjects?

Before Mr. Mehta went to the Hill it was evident to him, from his information, "that deep and bitter discontent had been evoked" on account of the mode of enforcing the plague regulations, "among the Native visitors to the Hill, of all ranks and classes and communities." He expected to find the complaints exaggerated; but, he says, "to my surprise, I found from personal experience and investigation that nearly every one of them was substantially well founded." It seems well worth while to set out "the chief complaints":—

> (1) That the old Plague regulations, which, without being harsh and oppressive, had been completely successful in protecting the Hill during the first two years, when it was far more continuously and largely crowded than this year, were suddenly altered by the

new Superintendent; and, while all Europeans were exempted, every Native visitor—man, woman and child—was compelled to attend the Superintendent's office for medical examination for ten days after date of arrival or pay a fee of Rs. 50 to the Superintendent for attending each visitor at his house every alternate day during the period of ten days.

(2) That those who declined to pay were herded together at the office with servants and bazaar people of all sorts, and had their wrists pounced upon by a middle-aged Hindu, neither over-cleanly nor over-dressed—a procedure deeply resented by ladies, many of them of the highest position in Native society.

(3) That the practice to allow the Assistant-Superintendent, always a qualified and experienced Hospital Assistant, to call at their houses, on a fee, ten times less than that of the Superintendent, was stopped, though he could not but be a more satisfactory examiner than the Hindu Karkun, and though the practice was said to be allowed even at Mahableshwar, where plague regulations, on account of its size and situation, were both more stringent as well as more rigidly enforced.

(4) That while Native visitors were thus treated even the servants of Europeans were partially exempted on the representations of their masters.

(5) That there was no provision for medical examination of females by qualified women.

(6) That, in the case of purdah women, the payment of Rs. 50 to the Superintendent as his fee became thus practically compulsory, under fear of being ordered off the hill or prosecuted under the Indian Penal Code.

This statement of Mr. Mehta's will reveal to the British people at home the very surprising discrimination of the Superintendent between Europeans and Indians. The absence of provision for medical examination of women by qualified women is wholly indefensible; and one can sympathise with the ungovernable anger of Mr. Essa Khalifa, the well-known Arab pearl merchant. Those that know, or know about, the munificent merchant, Mr. J. N. Tata, who was suffering from acute rheumatism in the legs, will appreciate his sense of the indignity put upon him when they read that "he dragged himself to the office, rather than pay the fee thus demanded, for a couple of days, and then gave it up, leaving the Superintendent to do what he liked." The discrimination between races was keenly and most properly resented. Mr. Mehta says justly :—

Major Collie has in several of his letters preached to Native visitors of position the beauty of setting an example. Unfortunately he did not preach the same sermon to Europeans, whose example would have been far more stimulating. The effect of the sermon was, besides, spoilt by the commuting of the example for money. I cannot help adding that Major Collie failed to see the real effect of his insistence on the great majority of people. When he insisted on people like Sir and Lady Jamsetji Jeejeebhoy, Mr. Justice B. Tyabji, Sir and Lady Jehanghir, Mr. Jamsetji N. Tata, and many others of position in their communities attending at the Office, while he exempted every European of every rank and grade, he was lowering them in the eyes of the people and setting up the stigma of racial inferiority. There was not even any decent arrangement for the examination of different sexes and classes. They were all herded together, and examined pell-mell as they chanced to reach the examining karkun.

When riots and disturbances arise over plague (or other) regulations, this case will suggest an enquiry as to the facts of the situation. It seems obvious that it was only the self-restraint of educated men of position that obviated a disturbance on the present occasion.

The petition of some 4,500 inhabitants of Poona presented to Lord Sandhurst is one of the saddest documents it is possible to imagine. It is in itself not difficult to sympathise with those who, on the third visitation of plague, have lost heart and hope, and ask only to be left to die in peace. But, as the *Mahratta* points out, it is unfair to treat the petition as a mere cry of fatalistic despair. It is true that the petitioners enumerate the various measures of plague prevention and the failure of each and all to stay what they have come to look upon as the chastisement of an offended deity. But this position, which is at least extremely logical, they partially abandon when they refer to evacuation as the true remedy and pray the Government to render that possible by the erection of such dwellings outside the town as will give the poor protection from sun, wind, and rain. We pointed out in our last issue how this had been done in the Native State of Mysore. Why cannot the same be done in Poona?

According to our anticipation last week, the Viceroy abandoned his intention of visiting Rajputana and also Ajmere, but he goes to Bhopal, Gwalior and the North-West Provinces, holding a durbar at Lucknow. In December, it is announced, he will visit privately the centres suffering from plague or famine, possibly going as far as the Bombay Deccan. The personal interest of the Viceroy in the afflictions of the people would undoubtedly be appreciated. On October 3 the Viceroy reported home that Burma and Bengal showed full average rice crops, capable of supplying the area of distress. But the autumn crop in the North-West Provinces was but two-thirds of the average; the Punjab showed fair prospects only in the Delhi divisions; the Central Provinces anticipated "serious and widespread distress" unless rain fell by mid October; Madras depended on the normality of the north-east monsoon; and Bombay was anxious for the northern districts, "where extensive relief will be required." The latest report is from Reuter's agent at Simla, dated October 3 :—

The Government will probably have to expend Rs. 1,500,000 between now and the end of March on famine relief in the Central Provinces, Bombay, and the Punjab, while the scarcity in the Rajputana States is likely to cost the chiefs Rs. 500,000. The local officials are fully on the alert, and relief operations are well in advance of the situation. Several railway projects, especially in Rajputana, have been made available for famine relief works. In Burma, Bengal, and Madras prospects are good, and in the North-West Provinces fair.

The one thing of importance is that the local officials should really have the eyes of their understandings well open, and should exceed rather than fall short of the necessary provision.

The subject of the Punjab Land Alienation Bill has had to wait a very long time for consideration by the Supreme Government. As long ago as 1871—twenty-eight years by the calendar—Mr. Justice West of Bombay published a pamphlet on the evils of the unrestricted transfer of land in India; and in 1886 Mr. S. S. Thorburn, "whose name," says the *Times* Simla correspondent naively, "is well-known to the English public in other connexions," wrote a book on "Mussulmans and Money-lenders." The same correspondent states the three leading features of the Bill as follows :—

(1) No permanent transfer of land will be allowed without the consent of the revenue authorities; but that consent will be taken as a matter of right when the transfer is from one of the money-lending class to an agriculturist or from an agriculturist to another of the same tribe in the same district.

(2) The measure will be of general application, and not, as Sir Dennis Fitzpatrick recommended when Lieutenant-Governor of the Punjab, merely an enabling Bill to be applied to particular districts as the local government should decide.

(3) Temporary alienation will be allowed for a period of fifteen years.

On the introduction of the Bill, Lord Curzon said "that ample time was being given for criticism and expression of opinions, and he deprecated hasty action, as the issues at stake were highly momentous." Very well; but why not start sooner? We all knew long ago that the Indian Government is "the largest landlord in creation," and some of us have for many years been insisting that "unless drastic steps were taken disaster would overwhelm the smaller yeoman classes." Only better late than never.

Though the subject is apparently new to Lord Curzon, he is said to have made (September 27) "one of the most able and striking speeches" upon it that he has yet delivered in Council. He tells us that the Bill not only represents the unanimous views of the Government of India and that it is supported by the Lieutenant-Governor of the Punjab, but also "has been accepted by the Secretary of State"—another illustration of the vicious system of interference that is no interference, and of the hopelessness of appeal in case Indian opinion prove adverse on any important point. With the approval of Lord George Hamilton pigeon-holed, Lord Curzon may complacently enough give people six months to consider the Bill. He said :—

So conscious are we of the importance of the precedent we are setting and of the far-reaching consequence of the solution we propose that we have resolved to give the amplest opportunity for the expression of the opinions, and even of the criticisms, of those whose interests will be affected.

Really, this is very "striking," but scarcely "able." We should call it "banal" in the last degree. For surely not only on this occasion, but on every occasion, and as a matter of course, there ought to be "the amplest opportunity for the expression of the opinions, and even of the criticisms, of those whose interests will be affected." Mark especially "even of the criticisms."

Where is the good of mouthing about the Government being "the largest landlord in creation," or telling people that "upon the contentment and solvency of the millions who live upon the soil is based the security of our rule," and like propositions that have been made intensely obvious by the prolonged neglect of Government? Everybody knows that for years and years "this canker of agricultural indebtedness" has been "eating into the vitals of India" generally, and not merely of the Punjab. For years and years we have been crying out against the Government neglect of this obvious and rapidly increasing evil. There are, of course, arguments against the restriction of the sale of land by rayats, but we conceive that they are mere dust in the balance compared with the importance of keeping the rayats in any event in possession of their holdings. The real mischief lies in the imposition of revenue demands out of reasonable proportion to the capacities of the rayat and his fields. This takes us back to the intolerable waste of public money upon trans-frontier enterprises, and upon the oppressive disturbances of the currency. Given rational economy in administration, there would never be the slightest need for such legislation as this; but since there is need, and crying need in consequence of the blunders and neglect of Government, we shall be anxious to support this Bill as far as may be, once we obtain full information as to its provisions.

The *Champion* devotes some space to the relations between the Provincial and Imperial Treasuries, grounding itself on the complaints of the Province of Bombay, so ably urged by Mr. Mehta at the Council table. Sir Evelyn Baring (now Lord Cromer) considered Bombay the most prosperous revenue-paying Province, but it has been so shorn by the central Government, always in want of money for its policy of military aggression, that it has been brought "to a condition of almost total exhaustion." It is the great blot on the present financial arrangement that in the "contract" made every five years between the Central and the Provincial authorities the Province that has husbanded its revenues finds that it is punished for its thrift and has only to pay the more as its Imperial contribution. The remedy which our contemporary proposes is certainly drastic. It is that the Central authority should be allowed only a fixed percentage of the revenue. If it chose to spend its money in frontier wars it must save in other ways and not trust to raids on the Provincial treasuries; in which case its zeal for aggression would probably undergo a great diminution. This is the only way to promote sound finance in the Provinces and to check extravagance at the centre.

The *Friend of India*, a leading Anglo-Indian newspaper of Calcutta, urges with great force that the Bengal Government, while careful to follow out the instructions of the Government of India where the curtailment of the power of the popular element in the Calcutta Corporation is concerned, has in one important particular set these instructions at defiance. The central authority, while proposing that as in Bombay one-third of the twelve members should be nominated by the Government and two-thirds elected by the Corporation, added that, taking into consideration the difference of the two cities, the Bengal Government will doubtless

> find it desirable to suggest some plan that will secure to that proportion (two-thirds) of the General Committee which is to be elected by the entire Corporation a strictly fair and proportionate representation of the constituent elements of the electoral body.

The *Friend of India* insists that this term "electoral body" cannot include the Government and that the obvious meaning of the words is that the eight elected members of the General Committee should be divided among the various elected members of the Corporation, whether representatives of wards or of special bodies, while the Government, which cannot be said to elect its representatives in the Corporation, would directly appoint four members of the General Committee.

But the Bengal Government, so submissive where the curtailment of popular liberties is at stake, here shows a different spirit. In the first place the new Bill does not require that eight members of the General Committee should be elected by the "entire Corporation." None are to be elected by the "entire Corporation," but four by one part (the representatives of the wards) and four by another part voting separately. But again, of these four one or more may, and probably will, be taken from among the nominees of the Government in the Corporation, who, if the instruction is to be interpreted as the *Friend of India* interprets it, ought to be excluded; so that the new Bill does nothing to secure a "proportionate representation of the constituent elements of the electoral body." On the contrary, the Ward Commissioners will be almost inevitably proportionally under-represented. Thus the Bengal Government, which professed to consider itself restricted to the specific recommendations of the Government of India, nevertheless sets those instructions at nought in one of the few cases where they are favourable to the representatives of the people.

The further consideration of the Telegraphic Press Messages Bill was postponed (Sept. 8) to the Calcutta Session. The Hon. Mr. Rivaz based this action of the Government of India explicitly on the fact that "the Bill had excited some comment and adverse criticism in India," and Lord Curzon "concurred entirely in the remarks made by the Hon. M. Rivaz." As the Bombay Presidency Association pointed out in their telegram urging the course the Government have now adopted, the procedure is only in accordance with established precedent. In any case, it is satisfactory to find that the Government of India pays heed to "comment and adverse criticism in India." If they would pay still more heed, and that more promptly, they would discover a much smoother path and get ahead much more efficiently than they do.

The Alexandra Native Girls' English Institution at Bombay dates from 1863, when it was founded by the late Mr. Manokji Cursetji and called after H.R.H. the Princess of Wales, whose marriage was celebrated about the same time. Not only has the Institution itself flourished continuously, but it has been the parent of similar schools in Poona, Ahmadabad, Mysore, Jalandar, Baroda, Lahore, and other towns, as well as in Bombay. The early idea of conducting the school as a purely English one, "intended to train girls to be like English girls in all branches of grace and refinement," was happily given up after but short trial, and since then it has been placed on the right footing of "fitting the better classes of Native girls by training and instruction to fulfil their work in Native societies and Native homes." Fundamentally a Parsee institution, it draws to itself Hindu and Mahometan pupils, "in a way to justify the hope that its founder cherished of the Institute serving as a bond of union between the various communities and creeds which go to make up the great Indian nation." This is extremely satisfactory and hopeful. It starts the union—the only true union—at the point nearest to the root, and on such principles as to ensure its permanence.

> "All your strength is in your union,
> All your danger is in discord."

The careful writer on "Indian Affairs" in the *Times* (October 4) draws attention to the difficulties that have been steadily closing in upon the indigo industry for a number of years past. "The indigo planters of Behar," he reminds us, "represent the oldest British industry in rural Bengal, and form a political force which has stood the Government in good stead in perilous times, the Behar Light Horse having been embodied in 1862 and still mustering 300." The system of production pursued by the Behar Planters Association during the past twenty-two years, a system "not strictly competitive as between labour and capital" but aiming "at securing the welfare of the population employed," has now "come into conflict with a European system of production on the most keenly competitive basis." Not only are inferior substitutes widely accepted in place of indigo, but some two years ago Professor Henmann of Zürich enabled artificial indigo, of the same chemical composition as the natural product, to be placed on the market at a price capable of competing with the natural article; and the manufacture has been taken up by the largest colour works in the world, the Badirche Anilin Soda Fabric at Ludwigshafen.

THE CALCUTTA MUNICIPAL BILL.

THE Calcutta Municipal Bill was passed into law by the Bengal Legislative Council on Wednesday, September 27. The telegram from our Calcutta correspondent, printed elsewhere, announcing this grave news reached us just too late for our issue of last week. We learn that the whole of the amendments proposed on the constitutional clauses of the Bill were rejected, and that the strong protests of Mr. Apcar, the representative of the Calcutta Corporation, and of the Hindu non-official members of the Bengal Legislative Council including Rájá Ranjit, the representative of the Bengal landholders, all went for nought. The Council had taken the bit in their teeth, and probably in that case the best course was to terminate the prolonged tension. The Act will now go before the Governor-General in Council. On the preceding Friday, our correspondent reports, a great public meeting was held in the Town Hall, when an earnest protest was made and a petition was adopted urging the Government of India to veto the measure. The feeling throughout the city is naturally running high. It is difficult to entertain any hope that the Governor-General will veto the measure on any essential point, or on any point whatever. Nor is it in the least doubtful how it will fare at the hands of the Secretary of State. Local self-government in Calcutta is doomed.

We have set forth at length the details of the conception and progress of this gravely ill-advised measure, and we have discussed them in every form at every stage of the proceedings. We have shown irrefragably that no such transformation of the Calcutta Corporation was either necessary or expedient on any ground that has ever been alleged. Who that contemplates a Bill in 11 parts, 42 chapters, and 668 sections, with a tail of 20 schedules, forming in all a considerable volume, charged with a revolutionary overturn of the whole system of the established local government of the first city in the British Indian Empire, would imagine that this deadly apparatus had grown out of the necessity of "enabling the Commissioners to recover licence tax from certain companies which now escape payment," and of "supplying an omission in Section 237 of the Act (of 1888) which renders it impossible for the Commissioners to exercise effective control over rebuilding and alterations in buildings"? Yet such is the official account of the genesis of this ominous measure. An extension of the original purpose of amendment was suggested by "the alarm of plague in Calcutta," and based upon the allegation that "the town was in a terribly insanitary condition, and that the present constitution of the municipality is ill-adapted to stand the strain of a grave and sudden emergency." If this allegation had been well founded, it would have been at once accepted by every citizen of Calcutta as a valid and urgent ground for a reform calculated to remedy a dangerous defect. But the allegation was not well founded. No enquiry had been made, no enquiry has even yet been made, for the purpose of demonstrating the alleged fact. If enquiry had been made, or were made now, it would be shown conclusively that the allegation is utterly mistaken. Early last year, in the Bengal Legislative Council, it was demolished completely in a memorable speech by the Hon. Surendra Nath Banerjea. Mr. Banerjea traced the history of Calcutta sanitation, citing the opinions of Mr. (afterwards Sir John) Strachey (1863); of Dr. Payne, the Health Officer (1876); of Mr. H. J. S. Cotton, now Chief Commissioner of Assam, in his report of a special Commission on the point (a few years later); a resolution describing (1890) the work of the Municipal Commissioners and their eminent Chairman, Sir Henry Harrison; the opinion of Mr. H. Lee, Sir Henry Harrison's successor, in the annual report of the proceedings of the Municipal Commissioners during 1891-92; and of Sir Antony MacDonnell, Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal (1893). All these opinions were reproduced by Mr. Romesh C. Dutt in an article in INDIA on May 13, 1898 (pp. 295-6). "No body of workers," said Mr. Dutt justly, "could have done more within their resources; no body will be able to do more in future." The allegation of danger from plague was completely refuted: the measures adopted by the Commissioners warded off the plague from Calcutta.

It was only the other week that we examined the more recent arguments put forward by the authorities (INDIA, Sept. 15 and 22, pp. 132 and 145). We then showed how the two Notes of Dissent by the Hon. Surendra Nath Banerjea and the Hon. Mr. Apcar completely overthrew the whole official array of contentions. It is, we venture to maintain, utterly impossible for any unbiassed judge, in face of these Notes of Dissent, to give any weight whatever to the allegations (1) that talk hinders work, (2) that the system fails to secure adequate representation of the different Native interests, (3) that it practically excludes European men of business from share in the municipal government, (4) that party spirit is growing and that there has appeared among the elected Commissioners a class of professional and in some cases corrupt politicians, (5) that abuse of the Committee system has paralysed the Executive officers and demoralised the subordinate staff, and (6) that there has been in consequence a break-down of the conservancy and water supply and of every department of municipal administration. Every one of these allegations has been shown to be untrue, or absurdly exaggerated; and, when the fullest account has been taken of the shortcomings and the weak points of the Corporation, it still remains incontestable that an effective remedy does not require any organic reconstruction whatever. We also demonstrated that the suggestions—that is, the commands—of the Government of India to the Bengal Government only made matters worse than before. To fall back on the Bombay system, either in whole or in part, is to take a seriously retrograde step; and to reduce the elected Commissioners by one half is to place the Corporation absolutely in the hands of officialdom and to extinguish local self-government in fact, while maintaining it in name and in appearance, in the capital city of India. This is a reform that throws back the administration of the city into a system that failed disastrously in the past, and that must inevitably fail disastrously again.

It is a standing commonplace of Indian government that Europeans find the utmost difficulty in probing Native opinion, and that British officials are steadily drifting farther and farther from the means of knowledge of Indian thought and feeling. But on this serious question of the administration of Calcutta, there can be no doubt whatever as to the Native opinion. Our Calcutta correspondent has reported a dozen meetings, some of them admitted to number as many as 4,000 persons, and every one of them presided over by a gentleman of distinction and influence and addressed by the acknowledged leaders of the community. There was a time when we possessed official representatives in Calcutta with sense enough to appreciate the significance of such demonstrations and sympathetic genius enough to give due weight to them in practical resolutions. But that time is past and gone. Now there has grown up a narrower intelligence and a harsher spirit. The intellectual and moral temperament of our great officers has been transformed by the potency of military and Imperialistic pride and dominance. We have ceased to rule; we have begun to domineer. In the past few years we have been remarking from week to week the progress of a new and dread spirit of persistent repression—repression in the Legislative Councils, in the newspaper offices, in the open street. This new-fangled legislation for the transmogrification of the Calcutta Corporation into a Government annexe is but one of the many examples of this universal and infatuated spirit. Even in 1885, Mr. H. J. S. Cotton wrote, from ample personal observation, that the Natives "are embittered, deeply embittered, at their exclusion from power, at the deliberate neglect of assurances in their favour solemnly made and repeatedly renewed, at the contemptuous manner in which they are treated by Europeans, and at the insolence with which their legitimate aspirations are spurned and set aside." Can any man suppose that this bitter feeling is less intense in 1899 than it was in 1885? Could there be any more outrageous example of their exclusion from power and the insolent spurning of their legitimate aspirations than this ill-omened Bill, which tells the citizens of Calcutta to their face, after a quarter of a century of splendid municipal achievement, that they are incompetent to manage their own affairs, and insults them with absolute subjection to official power under the forms of self-government?

Again we appeal to the people at home, who prize the right of managing their own local affairs. There is not a town councillor or a county councillor here, or a citizen who appreciates the work of his town or county council,

that ought not to take home to himself the plight of the people of Calcutta. They will be told, no doubt, of the hopeless incapacity of the "chattering Baboo"—a lie ever ready on the unscrupulous or ignorant tongue. Let us again cite Mr. Cotton:—

The people of India possess an instinctive capacity for local self-government, which centuries of misrule have not eradicated. . . . . As it is the development of local independence and self-government which more than anything else has given stability to the political institutions of England, so it is by a system of localised administration that we may hope for improvement and stability in the political institutions of India. We have sown throughout the Empire the seeds of representative government, and it remains to foster their growth. . . . . We know that internal pressure is powerless; it leads to repression only, the only ultimate outcome of which must be a national outbreak. The one chance of a peaceful solution rests with the English people, who alone have it in their hands to effect a material modification of the Anglo-Indian attitude by means of the external pressure of public opinion from the mother country.

This question, then, is of serious Imperial concern. Will the British people, with whom alone rests "the one chance of a peaceful solution" of the Indian problem, sustain the foolish principle of "repression" now in vogue, with the risks of "a national outbreak" as "the only ultimate outcome"? Not an outbreak in the form of armed resistance, but, as foreshadowed by the resignation of more than half of the elected Commissioners of the Calcutta Corporation, the *vis inertiae* of an aggrieved spirit, ending in the paralysis of civil government.

THE LESSONS OF THE RANGOON OUTRAGE.

IT is not unnatural that Englishmen should dislike to hear of the misdoings of their countrymen in India, and that they should be inclined to disbelieve anything that reflects discredit on British soldiers or British government. It is the same feeling that has made great numbers of Frenchmen refuse to believe in the guilt of the French officers who persecuted an innocent comrade. But such feelings, however natural, become dangerous when they are allowed to conflict with the sense of justice. The honour of the army is best preserved not by ignoring, still less by concealing crime, but by an honest and open attempt to rectify what is amiss and so prevent its recurrence. It is in this spirit that we again approach the painful subject of the treatment of Indians by Europeans, and the terrible crimes which have dishonoured the English name. It is assuredly not by soldiers alone that assaults on Indians have been committed. Some of the worst have been the work of men in civil life. But it must be remembered that soldiers are at once more immediately under the control of the authorities and that their misconduct more directly discredits our rule, and it is a case wherein soldiers were the culprits which seems to have at last roused the higher powers to a sense of their responsibility. It is not our intention to deal with the details of the Rangoon outrage, still less to question the verdict of the jury acquitting the men brought to trial, nor to join issue with the ruling of the learned Recorder that the statements which the accused had made to the military authorities were inadmissible as evidence, though to the lay mind this savoured rather of Rennes than of Rangoon. Our reference to this painful case is due only to our desire to see what light it throws on the general question of assaults on Indians and the means to be taken for their prevention.

It is indeed eminently unsatisfactory that an outrage taking place in broad daylight and in the presence of many persons should have so far gone entirely unpunished —a result which, however easily explained, cannot fail to shake that faith in British justice which has always been one of our great sources of strength. But the important rider which the jury added to their verdict has not only done something to remove this impression but has thrown great light on the points at issue in the recent debate in the House of Lords. It will be remembered that when Lord Stanley of Alderley undertook the difficult and unpopular task of bringing the frequency of assaults on Indians before the public, Lord Onslow and Lord Lansdowne adopted three lines of defence. In the first place they both argued, and in this Lord Kimberley supported them, that there was no increase but rather a decrease in such crimes. At the best this is, when one considers the number of such cases within the last two years, a terrible indictment against our soldiers in the past; and though it may well be true as regards the number of such offences, it is difficult to suppose that many of these could have been as serious as the murder of Dr. Sircar or the outrage at Rangoon. But it was really no part of the charge that the number of such outrages was increasing. The gravamen of the indictment was that they were now so numerous and heavy as to constitute a menace to the good name of England. Secondly, Lord Onslow averred that the conduct of soldiers in India was as good as in England, and here we think his lordship did the army great injustice. To compare the drunken frolics that occur now and again in our garrison towns, generally good-tempered and scarcely ever resulting in serious injury, with these terrible crimes, this grim succession of deaths and outrage, is to our mind entirely without justification. Moreover, it imputes to our soldiers and the classes from which they are drawn a natural tendency to crimes of violence and attributes to this tendency offences which really arise from peculiar environment and the evil state of opinion to which they find themselves exposed in India. This point will bear some further consideration. For the moment, we turn to the third article of the defence, urged by Lord Onslow and Lord Lansdowne alike. They complained that Lord Stanley of Alderley had not distinguished between convictions and acquittals, and that it was only where a conviction had been obtained that an outrage could be held to have been perpetrated. It is here that the rider of the jury in the Rangoon case is so apposite, for though they found themselves forced to acquit the accused they emphatically declared that a crime had been committed. In fact a moment's consideration might have shown the noble lords that—even if we discount the inclination of European jurors to acquit Europeans—a failure to identify the assailant was no proof that an assault had not occurred, and that a failure to discover the criminal might take place even where there was ample proof of the existence of the crime. The jury at Rangoon has done well to dispose of Lord Onslow's argument—it may be hoped for ever.

One immediate effect of the Rangoon case has been the issue of a General Order directing that all charges of assaulting Indians brought against British soldiers shall be reported to the Government of India, the Army Headquarters, and other authorities, a most important step not so much for its effect in keeping the authorities informed as in showing both officers and men how seriously such cases are viewed. This is really the important matter. It is, indeed, of consequence that such crimes like others should be adequately punished, both to clear British justice from all taint of complicity and to prevent their recurrence. But it is at best a painful remedy. It can afford but poor compensation to the murdered Indian that some young English soldiers are eating their hearts out in an Indian prison, or that men who might have lived honoured lives had they never been exposed to the peculiar moral atmosphere of an Indian station must go henceforward with the brand of Cain upon their brow. Nothing less than a moral reformation based upon a nobler and better view of the relations between Indians and Englishmen will afford a real remedy for these evils.

That the General Order has already had some effect is shown by a letter signed "Thomas Atkins" which appears in the *Pioneer* and gives a curious opportunity of looking into the mind of an English soldier in India. The writer complains that the new order will not only "protect the poor Native from the strong arm of Thomas Atkins" but place "Thomas Atkins at the mercy of the gentle Native." And then he tells his own sad case. He kept back a small sum of money from a contractor who had done his work badly, and the contractor brought a false claim against him for Rs. 100. The case has been dismissed, but his wicked opponent has appealed to the Chief Court. Then "Mr. Atkins" continues thus:—

Either I must submit to be subjected to annoyance and expense in defending these false claims and incur further expense in prosecuting the man for bringing a false charge against me, or I must give him a thrashing to stop his nonsense. If I take the latter course he will no doubt proceed against me for assault in the Civil Court, and in view of the G.O.C.C. referred to above, I shall be severely punished by the military authorities. What am I to do? I cannot afford the luxury and expense of legal aid, nor can I afford to lose an eleven years' exemplary character by committing an offence against both civil and military law.

To thrash the plaintiff is no doubt a most expeditious way of stopping a lawsuit. But it is doubtful if "Mr. Atkins" would have thought of using it in England, though false

claims, especially from the defendant's point of view, are not unknown in this country. Two things appear very clearly in the letter: first, that the writer is very much more afraid of military than of civil justice, and secondly, that he believes himself justified in treating Indians as he would never think of treating an Englishman under the same circumstances. And remember that this man who talks so lightly of giving an Indian a thrashing is on his own showing a soldier of eleven years' exemplary character.

It is in fact very well to talk of the splendid qualities of the English race and of its superiority over all others, but such talk has a tendency to belie itself, so that the tale of virtues fosters vice, producing a vain-glorious and domineering type of character which will in time make us hateful to the whole world. Nor is it possible to be blind to the fact that those who are most ready to preach up our civilising mission and our Imperial benevolence in undertaking the management of other people's concerns do little to fit us for the task. They cry to us to take up "the white man's burden," but view with indifference a course of conduct which must render the assumption of that burden vain. It is not from them that denunciation of outrage and murder comes, though the commission of such crimes necessarily weakens their position. Even now there may be Englishmen, weak in faith, who doubt whether the morality and civilisation of Burma have been very considerably raised by the presence of the Royal West Kent Regiment, though it bears the proud title of "the Queen's Own." Might it not be well if the apostles of Empire not only preached to us the need of taking up this burden but impressed upon us the duty of abstaining from thrashing those whom we so fervently desire to benefit? The British soldier when he goes to India finds himself among men of his own race who openly despise and contemn the people of the country. Young and impressionable he receives the evil gospel from his superiors and his soldier comrades and hands it on in turn to those who come after him. He lives in a narrow world where Indian life and Indian honour are held cheap, a world in which the current maxims and practice are eminently fitted to smother his natural good temper and kindliness of heart, and to cultivate arrogant violence and ignorant contempt. But how are the soldiers to be blamed when officers themselves are tainted; when we only see the insulting word of the one become the brutal deed in the rougher natures of the other? A change of temper, a new state of mind, is needed in all ranks of the British army and in all sections of Anglo-Indian society.

VILLAGE COMMUNITIES IN INDIA.[1]

IN this little volume Mr. Baden-Powell continues the assault upon Sir Henry Maine's theories which he began, courteously and indeed reverently, in a larger volume published in 1896 with an almost identical title. A teacher recently questioned an authority on archæology as to the present value of Sir H. S. Maine's great work on "Ancient Law." Had not its conclusions been largely shaken? Was he still to recommend his pupils to read it? "Oh, yes," was the prompt reply, "you must tell them to read it. Its conclusions are wrong, but there is nothing to take its place." The great merit of Sir H. S. Maine's writings has also proved to be, in a sense, their great defect. He had a remarkable power of seizing upon some apparently simple and leading principle which seemed to bind together and explain the facts. It is this power, added to a clearness of presentment worthy of a French savant, which makes his works such admirable text-books for the student, illuminating and stimulating. On the other hand, his hypotheses were only colligations of facts, not proved inductions. They are helpful so long as they are taken at their true value, but dangerous if they are accepted as axiomatic. Subsequent research has often shown that they were based upon insufficient data. This has been notably the case with the theory which he put forward in his "Village Communities of the East and West" and his "Early History of Institutions," and which Mr. Baden-Powell attacks in the light of the much fuller information about the history of Indian villages which has become available since 1870.

[1] "The Origin and Growth of Village Communities in India." By B. H. Baden-Powell, M.A., C.I.E. London: Swan Sonnenschein, and Co., Ltd.

Sir H. S. Maine, as is well known, found in the Indian village community a survival of the original Aryan household. The Aryan Joint Family, of which he believed himself to have found traces in the West as well as in the East, in Ireland as well as in India, was a community smaller than a tribe, but larger than the modern family. It consisted of all who were bound together by a tie of blood-relationship, fairly distinct, whether real or fictitious; of all who would have attended the funeral of a common ancestor, supposing him to have died in their life-time. The ownership of the land belonged to this group. At first it was held in common, not divided into any distinct shares. Then it was divided into shares which were held for a time only and were re-divisible. Finally the shares ceased to be re-divided. Thus arose individual property in land which at first was unknown to the Aryans. As applied to India, the theory involved the statements or implications: (1) that there is a typical form of Indian village; (2) that the village land is owned in common, and that even where allotment has taken place the idea of cultivation in common is kept up by rules regulating the tillage of the separate holdings; (3) that the authority is lodged with the village council, the headman being a later development; (4) that the village community was the creation of the Aryan races; (5) that consanguinity was the original bond, but that in process of time the land became the bond which held its cultivators together; (6) that the existing communities are composite groups, forming a sort of higher and lower castes.

Mr. Baden-Powell's contentions in reply to each of these points may be briefly summarised as follows:—(1) The Indian village community has at least two types—the "joint village" and the "severalty village." The villages of the North-Western Provinces are of the "joint" type, and it was to these that the attention of Sir H. S. Maine was almost exclusively directed. But (2) throughout Bengal, Central India, and the West and South, the prevalent form is the "severalty" type, in which the holdings are entirely separate, and no jointly owned area of "common" land belongs to the village. (3) The village headman is part of the original constitution; it is only the joint village that is governed by a council. (4) Village communities existed in India before the Aryan invasion. The Dravidians had developed agriculture for themselves. The extent to which India was organised has been much exaggerated; the probability is that the Aryans never reached the South except in small numbers—"Brahmans as teachers, and advisers to kings and princes, and soldiers of fortune seeking the command of armies or posts of state." Even in Northern India they rather formed a dominant class than a large proportion of the population. (5) Sir H. S. Maine underrates the influence of consanguinity in holding the village together. In many cases there was the actual feeling of family relationship, in others the wider sense of clan union. (6) The lower castes, the servants of the community, were never regarded as members of it.

In a short concluding chapter Mr. Baden-Powell deals with some of the practical aspects of village institutions. The village system exhibits the advantages and disadvantages of "peasant proprietorship" in a high degree. The chief disadvantage is, of course, the danger of excessive sub-division. Insufficiently large holdings result in debt, and thus the peasant must first mortgage and then sell his land. Can the State do anything to check the process of alienation of the land from the peasantry? Mr. Baden-Powell calls attention to a recent experiment in the Punjab, where artificial "villages" have been formed on land formerly waste and now irrigated by the Government. Settlers have been located there as tenants of the State, at a moderate rent and without any power of alienation.

Altogether the book, which is written in an admirably lucid style, is full of interest and merits the careful attention of all students of the early history of property.

The Simla correspondent of the *Times* telegraphed on Wednesday:—Summary disciplinary measures, which there is good reason to believe will involve the dismissal of all the members of the regiment implicated, have been taken by the Army Headquarters in regard to the soldiers of the West Kent Regiment connected with the Rangoon outrage. The military authorities cannot, of course, express an opinion on or review the sentence of Civil Courts, but they consider, and the public endorse their conclusion, that quite sufficient evidence exists of disgraceful conduct fully justifying summary action of the kind indicated.

THE PEOPLE OF INDIA: THEIR MANY MERITS BY MANY WHO HAVE KNOWN THEM.

Collected and Edited with an Introduction by ALFRED WEBB, (*President Tenth Indian National Congress*).

IV.

DR. FAIRBAIRN. *Haskell Lecturer to India*, 1898.

'Everywhere touched by the signal courtesy and intellectual quickness of the Hindus.' . . . . 'The grace and kindness and courtesy and patience with which they would bear even what they must have either disliked or greatly dissented from, made them signally attractive, and gave them a charm which one would need to feel long before being able to thoroughly appreciate. One thing is certain—that the Hindu mind will be influenced by no one who is out of sympathy with it.'—'*India*,' *May* 26, 1899.

H. FIELDING. *British Official in Burma during the War and since.* (*Writing in* 1898.)

[Burma technically is not India, but as, in the minds of most persons it is included therein, the following is given.]

'I have been trying to see into the soul of this people [the Burmese], whom I love so well, and nothing has struck me more than the way they regard crime and punishment; nothing has seemed to me more worthy of note than their ideas of the meaning and end of punishment, of its scope and its limits. . . . . We purposely make punishment degrading; they think it should be elevating, that in its purifying power lies its sole use and justification. We believe in tearing a soiled garment; they think it ought to be washed.' . . . . 'With us when we have made a little money we keep it to be a nest egg to make more from. Not so a Burman; he will spend it. And after his own little wants are satisfied' . . . . 'sometimes even before all this—he will spend the rest on charity.' . . . . 'There are rest houses everywhere. Far away in the dense forest by the mountain side you will find them, built in some little hollow by the roadside by someone who remembered his fellow-traveller. You cannot go five miles along any road without finding them.' . . . . 'And in Burmese times such roads and bridges as were made were made in the same way by private charity.' . . . . 'The Burmans give in charity far more in proportion to their wealth than any other people.' . . . . 'All shooting, either for sport or for food, is looked upon as disgraceful.' . . . . 'The Burman's compassion towards animals goes very much farther than a mere reluctance to kill them.' . . . . 'Surely a people who could act like this have the very soul of religion in their hearts, although the act was not done in the name of religion.' . . . . 'Our innate feeling towards all that we consider inferior to ourselves is scorn; the Burmans is compassion.'—'*The Soul of a People*,' *H. Fielding. Macmillan and Co.* 1898.

SIR CHARLES FORBES. *Twenty-two years service in India; Speaking in* 1839:—

'Be kind to the Natives; treat them as your equals and fellow-subjects—give them your confidence, and you will be amply repaid: "Gratitude" is their natural motto. They may forget an injury, but a kindness never! This I say, after living among them twenty-two years, and twenty-eight years after leaving them.'—'*Bombay Champion*,' *June* 25, 1899.

COLONEL P. T. FRENCH. *Thirty years service in India; Resident at Baroda; Chairman Bombay and Baroda and C. I. Railway Co.; Writing in* 1868:—

'I have been associated with none of your countrymen who are what I presume you mean by the expression "educated Natives," and, therefore, can give no opinion of them in the manner described, from personal knowledge. But I must add I have always heard them highly spoken of, and at the same time—while reminding you of being always an humble follower of yours in endeavouring to afford to the people of India the best education that could be—I was quite satisfied with the Natives as I found them in integrity and efficiency, in the various offices I have held during nearly thirty years' service in India, though they were not what you call educated. I know not your object in now writing to me, but be it what it may I only wish I could express myself as I feel regarding very many natives of India I have served Government with, their integrity, zeal, and efficiency.'—'*Admission of Educated Natives into the Indian Civil Service*,' *Dadabhai Naoroji, M.P., Commercial Press, Bombay*, 1893.

VISCOUNT GOUGH, F. M. *Served in India*, 1837-1849; *Writing of the Sikhs after Sabraon.*

'Policy prevented my publicly recording my sentiments of the splendid gallantry of a fallen foe; and I declare, were it not from a conviction that my country's good required the sacrifice, I could have wept to have witnessed the fearful slaughter of so devoted a body.'—'*The Sikhs and the Sikh Wars*,' *General Sir C. Gough and Arthur D. Innes, M.A., Innes and Co.*, 1897.

SIR LEPEL H. GRIFFIN, K.C.S.I. *Bengal Civil Service* 1861 *to* 1889. *Chairman of Council of East India Association from* 1894.

'Poor, simple, honest hearts! they did not know that, judged by any truthful standard, the people of India were on a far higher level of morality than Englishmen; that they were industrious, sober, chaste, and religious; that a drunken man was rare, unless he were an Englishman; and that a drunken woman was unknown.'—*Supplied in MS. by Mr. Talcherkar.*

COUNT ANGELO DE GUBERNATIS. *Italian Orientalist, Professor of Sanscrit, Rome*, 1891.

'I am not aware whether special instructions regarding their bearing towards the Natives are given to military and civil servants previous to their leaving England for India. To judge from their behaviour on their arrival in Bombay, one could almost believe that they were instructed to act as if the following was their creed: "India does not belong to the Indians but to the English; the Indians are a savage and ignorant nation, who can only be ruled by the whip." [After describing incidents which suggested these remarks, he observes.] 'Why does not the English Government prevent these objectionable practices by inculcating better ideas of discipline on the youths destined for service in India? Would it not be wise before they leave England, when too many of them are entirely ignorant of India or have very incorrect notions about it, to warn these young candidates for civil and military careers that they are not going into a savage and barbarous country, but to a country famous for its antiquity and its civlisation, and still more for its institutions, and among whose inhabitants are good and intelligent men, deserving to be governed with gentleness and consideration.'—*Supplied in MS. by Mr. Talcherkar, from* '*Travels in India*,' *quoted in* '*Indian Spectator*,' *November* 20, 1871.

WARREN HASTINGS. *Served in India* 1750 *to* 1764, 1769 *to* 1781; *Governor-General of India.*

'Great pains have been taken to inculcate into the public mind an opinion that the native Indians are in a state of complete moral turpitude, and live in the constant and unrestrained commission of every vice and crime that can disgrace human nature. I affirm, by the oath that I have taken, that this description of them is untrue and wholly unfounded. What I have to add must be taken as my belief, but a belief impressed by a longer and more intimate acquaintance with the people than has fallen to the lot of many of my countrymen.' . . . . [The Hindus] 'are gentle, benevolent, more susceptible of gratitude for kindness shown them, than prompted to vengeance for wrongs inflicted, and as exempt from the worst properties of human passion as any people upon the face of the earth; they are faithful and affectionate in service, and submissive to legal authority; they are superstitious it is true, but they do not think ill of us for not thinking as they do. Gross as the modes of their worship are, the precepts of their religion are wonderfully fitted to promote the best ends of society, its peace and good order; and even from their theology arguments may be drawn to illustrate and support the most refined mysteries of our own.'—'*Hansard's Debates*,' *April* 5, 1813.

REGINALD HEBER. *Bishop of Calcutta*, 1823-1826.

'Of the people' [of India] 'so far as their natural character is concerned, I have been led to form, on the whole, a very favourable opinion. They are men of high and gallant courage, courteous, intelligent and most eager after knowledge and improvement.' . . . . 'They are sober, industrious, dutiful to their parents, and affectionate to their children; of tempers almost uniformly gentle and patient, and more easily affected by kindness and attention to their wants and feelings than almost any men whom I have met with.'—'*India for the Indians and for England*,' *William Digby, C.I.E., Talbot Brothers*, 1885.

A. O. HUME, C.B. *Served in India*, 1849 *to* 1881; *C.B. for services through the Mutiny.*

'The fact is—and this is what I, who claim to have had better opportunities of forming a correct opinion than most men now living, desire to urge—there is no such radical difference between Indians and Britons as it too generally flatters these latter to suppose. The colour of the skins differ, and the ways and methods of thought of the two races; both descended from the same ancestral stock, have also come under the pressure of different environments to differ during the lapse of long ages, but at the bottom their hearts are much the same. Each race exhibits in a greater degree of development, virtues and vices, which are less prominent in the other; but if both races be judged impartially, and all *pros* and *cons* be fairly set down on both sides, there is very little ground for giving the preference to either. If you compare the highest and best of our Indians with the ordinary run of the rabble in England, these latter seem little better than monkeys beside grand men. If you compare the picked Englishman we often get in India, trained and elevated by prolonged altruistic labours, and sobered and strengthened by weighty responsibilities, with the rabble of India, the former shine out like

gods amongst common mortals. But if you fairly compare the best of both, though each class will exhibit excellencies and defects less noticeable in the other, neither can as a whole be justly said to be better or worse than the other. No doubt amongst India's 250,000,000 there are too many of whom no good report can be made, and these being the men who chiefly fawn upon and strive to curry favour with Europeans, are those by whom these latter mostly guage the national character, but, may I ask, are there any lack of similar ne'er-do-weels even among the 30,000 of Britons? The whole misconception arises from the habit Englishmen in India have acquired of regarding only the blackest side of the Indian and the brightest side of the English character, and from their theories as to the capacities of the two races being based on a consideration of the worst specimens of the one and the best specimens of the other.'—*Examination of Mr. A. O. Hume, C.B., by the Public Service Commission, Calcutta, March* 1, 1887; *Central Press, Calcutta*, 1887.

Sir William W. Hunter, K.C.S.I., C.I.E. *In Indian Service* 1862-1887; *Author of many standard Works on India.*

'But the noblest survivals of Buddhism in India are to be found, not among any peculiar body, but in the religion of the whole Hindu people; in that principle of the brotherhood of man, with the reassertion of which each new revival of Hinduism starts; in the asylum which the great Hindu sect of Vaishnavs affords to women who have fallen victims to caste rules, and to the widow or the outcast; in that gentleness and charity to all men, which take the place of a poor-law in India and give a high significance to the half satirical epithet of the "mild" Hindu. The highly cultivated Brahman is a pure theist; the less cultivated worships the Divinity under some chosen form, his *ishta-devatá*. The ordinary Brahman, especially in the South, takes as his "chosen deity" Siva in his deep philosophical aspects as the fountain of being and of reproduction, the symbol of death deprived of its terrors and welcomed as the entrance into new forms of life. The phallic *linga* serves him as an emblem of the unseen God. The middle classes and the trading community adore some incarnation of Vishna. The low-castes propitiate Siva the Destroyer, or one of his female manifestations, such as the dread Kálí. But almost every Hindu of education feels that his outward object of homage is merely his *ishta-devatá*, or a "chosen" form under which to adore the Supreme Deity, Param-eswara.' '*Brief History of the Indian People,' Sir W. W. Hunter, K.C.S.I., C.I.E., Clarendon Press*, 1893.

William A. Hunter, LL.D., M.P. (*Writing in* 1894.)

'It is probable that perjury is more rampant in Criminal Courts in India; but if we look to the County Courts or the Divorce Court it will be found that Englishmen pretty well hold their own. There is, however, one marked difference between the Oriental and Western mind that is most impressive. There is simply no comparison between Englishmen and Hindus with respect to the place occupied by family interests and family affections in their minds. The love of parents for children and of children for parents has scarcely any counterpart in England. Parental and filial affection occupies among our Eastern fellow-citizens the place which is taken in this country by the passion between the sexes. Love as depicted in English novels plays a small part in Indian Society, for the choice of a mate is not often left by Indian custom to the parties concerned; but its absence is more than made up by the intensity of the attachment that exists between members of the same family. The "Family" in the old sense of the word still exists in India; in England it is a very different institution. The romance of Indian life is the romance, not of the individual, but of the family. There is good and there is evil in both systems. A criminal trial that took place in Bengal only a few years ago will perhaps make the contrast more clearly apparent. An Indian cultivator was tried for the murder of his daughter, aged about eight years. Strong police evidence was produced showing that the girl had died of a stab wound, and, if her death was so caused, there was nobody but the father who could well have committed the offence. The man was convicted. A Native solicitor who heard the trial was so impressed with the conviction that a Hindu father could not commit such a crime that, at his own expense, he engaged counsel to appear when the sentence came up for confirmation in the High Court. When the evidence was closely looked into, it appeared that the wound which was supposed to have caused the death of the child was inflicted after death, and accordingly the High Court ordered a new trial, and the man's innocence was established. The solicitor's belief in the gigantic improbability of a Hindu killing his own child was justified. But in England there is a widespread belief that large numbers of children were destroyed by their parents in order to gain a paltry insurance money, and many persons are anxious for that reason to put a stop to child insurance. Again, we have a society for the prevention of cruelty to children, and it has much more work to do than it can overtake.' . . . . 'The third peril to our Indian Empire arises from a cause of which Englishmen are little conscious, and in that lies the danger—namely, an overbearing manner towards the people of India, especially towards persons in the higher rank. It is difficult to exaggerate the sensitiveness of Indians to outward demeanour, or the immense mischief which a certain class of our Indian rulers do intentionally and, for the most part, unconsciously. I am far from suggesting that every competition-wallah should be taught to observe that dropping-down deadness of manner which Sidney Smith says is a proper thing for a curate in the presence of a bishop, but there is surely a happy mean between servility and rudeness. It is not too much to say that many Englishmen do as much as in them lies to make our Government hateful. The Government might do much to effect an improvement. Too often even in the worst cases it is content with an empty censure. More than that is required. If every Civil Servant were made to feel that his prospects of professional advancement would be seriously retarded, or even jeopardised, by a too liberal indulgence in the luxury of an offensive and overbearing manner, a great improvement would rapidly take place. No people can like subjection to a foreign power, and it is true policy and wisdom for the British governor to make the yoke as light and easy as possible. The difficulties in our way are great enough in all conscience without increasing them by habitual indulgence in a spirit of unrestrained rudeness. Too many of our Civil Servants seem unable to understand that they may be firm and strong without being insolent. This may seem a small matter—faults of manner are easily pardoned by those who indulge in them—but there can be no question that a great part of our difficulties would be removed if every Indian gentlemen were treated in India as he is always treated in England.'—*Supplied in MS. by Mr. Talcherkar, from 'India and Great Britain,' by W. A. Hunter, LL.D., M.P., London*, 1894.

General G. Le Grand Jacob. *Distinguished Service in India.* (*Writing in* 1868.)

'There are nearly two hundred millions of human beings in India. Of course, the great mass have no idea beyond filling their bellies, as they say; but there are thousands and hundreds of thousands of deep-thinking, far-sighted men, in addition to whom there is all the rising generation, many of them quite equal in intellectual ability and moral worth to any English gentleman. I have the pleasure of calling several such men my personal friends, with whom I correspond, and I have very few English friends superior to them in attainments or character. This class is rapidly rising all over India in thousands—men who have reflected and reasoned, and have every year more and more influence over their countrymen.' . . . . 'During the last thirty years that I have been at the head of a province or provinces, or a political officer at a foreign court, I have made it a rule to select men for employ under me from the different colleges and schools of the Presidency, from Ahmedabad in the north to Ratnagiri and Sawuntwaree in the south, both Mahometan and Hindu, and there are numbers who have been so selected who are now filling high and responsible appointments in the different parts of Western India. The accounts that have reached me of them since my return to England bear testimony of their usefulness and trustworthiness. In all my selections (which, however, were made with care) only one may be said to have failed, and he more from the caprice and faults of others than from his own. I certainly should not have expected so large a proportion of good men and true even from the educated classes of my own country.'—*Same source as views of Colonel P. T. French.*

(To be continued.)

THE PUNJAB LAND ALIENATION BILL.

We are glad to see that an effort, although far from a strenuous one, is to be made by the Simla Government to check the ravages of Indian money-lenders among the rural population. A Bill has been introduced into the Legislative Council by Mr. Rivaz, called the Punjab Land Alienation Bill, whose object is to prevent the wholesale alienation of land from the cultivators. It is to do this by providing that no permanent transfer of land will be allowed without the consent of the Revenue authorities except when the transfer is from money-lenders to agriculturists, or from one agriculturist to another of the same tribe in the same district. It is to be a law of general application, and will further permit temporary alienation up to fifteen years. This is a well-intended measure, we have no doubt, but why limit it to the Punjab, and why not inquire into the causes of the ravages perpetrated by the usurers? All over India, ever since we systematised the oppression of land revenue collection there, their ravages have resembled that of the driver ant which, attacking a fallen tree, turns the wood of it to dust, leaving the bark to deceive the passer-by into the belief that the wood is still there. All over India the number of compulsory transfers has grown at a perfectly appalling speed, when we come to look at the figures. In the Punjab as recently as 1879 the number of compulsory transfers of real estate, the acres of the farmer mostly into the hands of the usurer, we may say almost invariably, was only 40,650. In the year ended March 31, 1898, it was 112,359. In Bengal, again, the number has risen from 349,094 in 1879 to 929,508 in 1897-8. Madras gives the same warning, the figures being 207,873 for 1879, each year ending on March 31, and 598,013 for 1898. For the whole of India the number of compulsory transfers of land has risen from 801,137 in 1879 to 2,045,878 in 1897-8. In these figures we get some inkling of the blight that expensive government is spreading amongst the hard-working classes of farmers who form the mainstay of the State.—*The Investors' Review.*

THE CALCUTTA MUNICIPAL BILL.

THE BILL PASSED.

REPRESENTATIVE PROTESTS IGNORED.

AMENDMENTS REJECTED WHOLESALE.

GREAT MEETING OF PROTEST.

PUBLIC EXCITEMENT.

[BY CABLE, FROM OUR OWN CORRESPONDENT.]

CALCUTTA, *September* 28.

The Bengal Legislative Council yesterday passed the Calcutta Municipal Bill.

The representative of the Calcutta Corporation, Mr. Apcar, and all the Hindu non-official members of the Legislative Council, including Rájá Ranjit who represents the Bengal landholders, strongly protested against the measure.

All the proposed amendments to the constitutional clauses of the Bill were rejected.

A great public meeting was held in the Calcutta Town Hall last Friday, when an earnest protest was made and a petition was addressed to the Government of India requesting it to veto the Bill.

The public mind here is greatly agitated upon the matter.—*By Indo-European Telegraph.*

The *St. James's Gazette* wrote (October 2):—A telegram has just been sent to INDIA, which has passed almost unnoticed up to the present in the London Press, but which may, perhaps, chronicle a grave parting of the ways in our method of governing India. The Bengal Legislative Council have passed the Calcutta Municipal Bill. This statement signifies nothing to the ordinary English reader, but what it means is that the experiment of grafting English representative institutions upon an Eastern population used to servitude has broken down in practice, that local self-government has been definitely pronounced by the Government of India to be a failure, and that the conditions upon which it was granted to the most important city in the country, namely, Calcutta, have now been revised. Of course the Bengali demagogue is agitated to the depths of his being at not being allowed any longer to mismanage the affairs of a great city.

The *Morning Leader* said (October 3):—The Calcutta Municipal Bill has now become law. The new enactment deals the death-blow at local self-government in the capital of India. It contrasts instructively though not pleasantly with our fervent demands for rights for Uitlanders in the Transvaal. The Calcutta Act robs Indians of the powers which they have hitherto exercised (and as official testimony shows exercised well) in a somewhat obvious way. It reduces by fifty per cent. the number of popular representatives on the Calcutta Corporation while the number of official and other European representatives is left without change. This is Lord Curzon's plan. The earlier plan, which was due to Sir Alexander Mackenzie, was a thought more astute. It did not tamper with the numbers of the municipal Commissioners, but it deprived the Corporation of all real power over the Executive Committee which does the work. The Bengal Legislative Council had approved the earlier Bill. But, when Lord Curzon interfered, it was quite ready to approve a different Bill. That is the sort of thing which Lord George Hamilton has in mind when he talks at large about the "independence of the local Legislative Councils" in India. The new Act means that Calcutta is in future to be governed without the help of the Indians. It is a daring experiment, and we are rather curious to see how it will end.

THE TELEGRAPHIC PRESS MESSAGES BILL.

TARDY CONCESSION TO CRITICISM.

THE BILL POSTPONED.

At the meeting of the Viceregal Legislative Council at Simla on September 8:—

The Hon. Mr. Rivaz, in asking leave to postpone the presentation of the report of the Select Committee on the Telegrams Copyright Bill, said he desired to express their entire approval of the principle of the Bill, and he had noticed that since its introduction the Committee in the House of Lords had proposed a similar protection at home for eighteen hours. The Bill had excited some comment and adverse criticism in India, and therefore the Committee thought it desirable to postpone consideration of the details, and postpone the presentation of the Select Committee's report till the Calcutta Session.

Lord Curzon concurred entirely in the remarks made by the Hon. Mr. Rivaz, and said that he thought that the Bill belonged to the category of those which should be dealt with in Calcutta.

NOTES FROM BOMBAY.

[FROM AN INDIAN CORRESPONDENT.]

BOMBAY, September 16.

The Currency Bill was passed yesterday at Simla. The telegram says that there was no discussion. This is not at all to be wondered at, as there was nobody in the Council on the breezy heights of the Himalaya to take exception to the measure from the point of view of the Indian community. At the last fortnightly meeting, when the Bill was introduced, there were three non-official Indian gentlemen present, but one of them has no knowledge of English—he who hails from the backward Punjab. Another was from the Central Provinces, but he is more versed in agricultural matters and tenancy legislation than in banking and commerce. Presumably he has thought it prudent to offer no opinion on so controversial a topic. The third Indian gentleman is not much known and so I cannot say anything of him. Practically, then, the Bill was rushed through its second and third stages without one "if" or "but." The mandate-bound officials were not the men to speak out their honest opinion. In matters legislative their private opinion is supposed to be one thing and their officially ordered opinion another. Is not this an anomalous way of legislating on a matter of far-reaching importance to the interests of the people? Would England allow a Currency Bill to be enacted in this fashion? It is here that one sees at once through the hollowness of the so-called "expanded" Legislative Councils. For all matters of a practical character they might as well not exist. Where is their utility if they cannot have a voice in legislation of a revolutionary character, legislation that is apprehended with the greatest anxiety by the banking and mercantile community of India, which from the beginning has declared the measure to be of more than doubtful utility? The two arguments urged in favour of the Bill are astonishing. Mr. Dawkins said that it would avoid financial embarrassments in future and prevent fresh taxation. Both statements are fallacious. Because we are going to have a gold currency, are we to believe that the Government will have no financial embarrassments in future? It may be reasonably asked whether the British Treasury and British Chancellors of the Exchequer have never met with deficits and embarrassment with their gold currency. And what is our own Indian experience? Has it not been the case that, despite enhanced taxation, we have had chronic deficit? Where is the guarantee that in the matter of Home Charges and trans-frontier aggression alone our Government may not so behave as to bring about a deficit, even with the gold currency? And if so, are we to believe that the necessities or follies of the Government will not drive them to raise taxation higher still? Yet we are treated to such transparent fallacies as the brace which Mr. Dawkins urged in introducing the Bill.

The Telegraphic Press Messages Bill has received a respite, thanks to the unanimous opposition of the Press, save the *Pioneer*, the *Englishman*, the *Times of India*, and the *Morning Post*. The Government has now announced that the Bill will be postponed to the next Calcutta Session, which practically means till the British Parliament has legislated.

The Calcutta Municipal Bill is still being debated in the Bengal Council, but it is all a losing game for the two non-official representatives of the ratepayers who are fighting their battle there. The official phalanx is arrayed against them. It is now not so much a question of facts and arguments with the Lieutenant-Governor and his majority as blind persistency, or "zid" as the *Indian Nation* very properly terms it. It will never do in India for the bureaucracy to say that it is defeated. It will never do for it even to acknowledge error. If an error is made the accepted policy is to persist in it. If the error has entailed a grievous wrong, the policy is to add another wrong. This is what the Bengal Council is doing at present. There were something over a hundred amendments from the opposition. Many of these are reported to have been summarily ruled out of order on the plea that they relate to the "principle" of the Bill, and are therefore inconsistent with it. Was ever such hair-splitting heard of in a legislative assembly? But, then, is not India a country of anomalies? India must, in short, be governed on two principles—the English when it suits our legislators to have that principle, as was fallaciously alleged with regard to the infamous Law of Sedition, and the Indian when it suits the self-same body to enforce it, as was the case in connexion with the bogus countervailing enactments on sugar. Sufficient for the day are the evils of Indian legislation. It would be more honourable to abolish the Councils, and for each imperial and provincial Cæsar to promulgate his own despotic ukase after the manner of the Czar or the Sultan.

Local self-government is undoubtedly the *bête noir* of the reactionary governing authorities in all parts of the Empire. There is a determined and deliberate conspiracy to root it out as far as practicable. What has been begun in Calcutta will perhaps be finished in the Punjab or the Central Provinces. Meanwhile it seems that the retrograde policy is sure to have full swing in Bombay, where the authorities are about to supersede the old Act of 1884 by a new one. The draft is already published, and the Legislative Council is summoned to discuss it on the 27th. We shall see how the non-official popular representatives fare there. What does all this show? In my opinion it is the consequence of a deep-rooted, but quite unfounded, policy of mistrust of the people. How unstatesmanlike is this policy will become known later. But has it ever been known that alien rulers have been able to govern with anything like success subject races who are mistrusted?

THE RANGOON OUTRAGE.

TRIAL OF JOHNSON.

[From the "Pioneer."]

Rangoon, September 11.

Private William Johnson, Royal West Kents, was put on his trial to-day before the Recorder and a special jury on a charge of being concerned in the outrage committed on a Burmese woman, named Mah Goon, by men of the West Kent Regiment. Mr. Fox, Government Advocate, went into the facts of the case at length. He then said it had been ruled that, in consequence of the inducement held out by the commanding officer, the statement made to officers of the regiment and before the Court of Enquiry in regard to the outrage could not be put in; but the present accused made a statement before the Cantonment Magistrate, he being the only one of all the accused persons who did so. In that statement the accused admitted connexion with the woman in the present case. Therefore the evidence for the prosecution would be the evidence of Sullivan and the accused's statement before Major Wyllie. Counsel continued, referring to a letter to the *Pioneer* and published locally: "But I dare say many of you have already read a warning note. You have, perhaps, heard that the prisoners' mouths have been closed so far. You have heard the Latin maxim, '*Audi alteram partem.*' As to the first, that is clap-trap. In England it used to be said by the counsel for the defence that prisoners' mouths were closed. That was so in England. A prisoner could not make a statement to the court. But by a recent Act this was altered. In this country it has never been the case that prisoners' mouths have been closed." Later on counsel said: "I quite admit the prisoners' mouths have been closed. They have been very lightly closed, not by reason of any law, but by reason of a conspiracy on the part of those who knew what happened on this occasion. Their mouths were opened on June 13 and 14, in consequence of Sullivan's evidence and the inducement of the commanding officer. On June 23 their mouths were about to be opened to the Cantonment Magistrate; but under the advice of an officer of the regiment they were closed again. 'Hear the other side,' that is what we (the prosecution) have from the first been trying to get before the jury. We have been unable to do this by reason of various principles of law which shut out the actual statements made by the other side. But in this case I hope you will hear the other side, and hear the other side fully. The defence are now in a position to call, not only all the other accused, but also one who has had the good fortune to escape conviction. The sole issue in this case of Johnson is whether the woman was a consenting party or not."

The evidence taken was similar to that in Thorpe's case. Mah Goon gave her evidence rationally. She seems much improved in mental and physical condition. She said two soldiers seized her on the road and dragged her up the hill. She remembered seven soldiers outraging her. She had never been to barracks, and never solicited soldiers.

The evidence to-day was mainly devoted to the past life and character of Mah Goon, of which the authorities have a very full record.

THE SUGAR BOUNTIES AND COUNTERVAILING DUTIES.

[From the "Manchester Guardian."]

We have received copies of two pamphlets, both entitled "The Indian Sugar Duties," but proceeding from different sources. One of them is a reprint of articles which have recently appeared in the Calcutta *Statesman*, and some correspondence connected therewith. The other is an article written by Sir Roper Lethbridge for the forthcoming number of the *Asiatic Quarterly Review*. The two papers agree in denouncing the European sugar bounties and in defending the Indian countervailing duties, one of them advocating the adoption of the countervailing policy. Both writers maintain that the bounties are a violation of the principle of Free Trade. One of them begins his argument, quite properly, by a definition of Free Trade. The *Statesman* says it is "that state of trade in which different producers, irrespective of nationality or class, meet in the markets of the country concerned on the footing of natural competition; in which, that is to say, no attempt is made by authority, by means of either the imposition of duties or the granting of subventions, or any other device, to discriminate artificially between them, so as to confer upon the class or classes in whose favour the discrimination is made an advantage in the market other than such as may result from their own superior skill, industry, or natural opportunities." Sir Roper Lethbridge nowhere formulates a definition of his own, but he quotes with approval one indicated by Lord George Hamilton in the House of Commons on June 15, when he said: "The object of Free Trade is to try and establish by a fiscal system equality of conditions, equality of treatment, and equality of opportunity for all producers in whatever part of the world they may live."

Now surely if these definitions of Free Trade are to be accepted they should at least be in accord with the teaching of the great leaders and expounders of the Free Trade movement, from Huskisson, Peel, and Villiers onwards. But it is easy to show that, so far from being in harmony with such teaching, these newly invented definitions are contradicted by the apostles and expounders of Free Trade. Speaking on July 6, 1849, Sir Robert Peel said: "The principles which should govern the commercial intercourse of nations do not differ from those which regulate the dealings of private individuals. It is the same law which determines the accumulation of wealth by the private trader and the powerful kingdom." We only obscure and mystify the truth by overlooking the principle which governs the dealings of every man of common sense." Accordingly, Sir Robert Peel went on to approve the doctrine enunciated in the famous "Petition of the Merchants" of 1820, that "the maxim of buying in the cheapest market and selling in the dearest, which regulates every merchant in his individual dealings, is strictly applicable as the best rule for the trade of the whole nation." Strictly applicable. And therefore the makers of Free Trade never dreamed of distinguishing between the cheapness which is the result of natural advantage or superior skill on the side of the producer and that which may result from the artificial advantage conferred by a foreign State or a colonial Government. The private trader makes no such distinction, and so neither should the nation at large as represented by its Government and Parliament. When, consequently, Lord George Hamilton tells us that it is an object of Free Trade to establish by fiscal means "equality of conditions" for all producers in whatever part of the world they may live he is propounding a doctrine clearly disavowed by the principle of Free Trade as taught by its founders, a doctrine, too, which is obviously impracticable and absurd. Equally wide of the mark also, in the light of Sir Robert Peel's words, is the *Statesman* when it says: "The imposition by other countries of import duties corresponding in amount to the bounties [given by an exporting country], instead of being a violation, is a vindication of the cardinal principle of Free Trade."

It may, indeed, be freely conceded that the giving of bounties is an interference with natural conditions, and that it may be and often is, inequitable, viewed from the standpoint of competitors—or, to use a term more frequently employed by the advocates of countervailing duties, it is "unfair." Such, moreover, are the extremely low rates at which merchandise is carried on the German State railways when it is sent from inland towns for export to markets in which it competes artificially with our own productions. Such, likewise, are the bounties given by the Canadian Government on exports of Canadian diary produce. And, of course, the bounties given by France and Germany on the building and sailing of ships stand in the same category. To come nearer home, English and Scotch farmers may complain, if they like, of the expenditure of public money by the Government in maintaining dairy schools and travelling dairy instructors in Ireland. For, owing to their influence, Irish butter has been greatly improved in quality, and is now competing with a degree of success never before known with the butter of England and Scotland. But in all these cases no private person in possession of his senses refuses to buy the commodity which, by the aid of bounties, has been improved in quality or reduced in price. According to the teaching of the founders of Free Trade, therefore, the nation ought not to refuse to buy bounty-fed sugar, nor ought Parliament, consequently, to impose a discriminating import duty on it.

There is yet a further important consideration which the advocates of a countervailing policy do not appear even to have thought of. They may be sure that if Parliament conceded what they demand in respect of bounty-fed sugar there would be further claims, which could not be consistently opposed, for the application of the same policy, quite as well founded as their own. To satisfy these would bring us into interminable complications, some of them very serious indeed. We should have to impose countervailing duties on Canadian "bounty-fed" butter and cheese. This contingency was

clearly foreseen by the quick intelligence of an Irish member of the House of Commons, who immediately after the Indian countervailing sugar duties were imposed inquired whether her Majesty's Government intended to put countervailing duties on Canadian dairy products. If a list were made of all the subsidies granted by foreign and colonial Governments in aid of the production or export of commodities sent to this country in competition with like commodities produced here, it would very soon become apparent that a consistent carrying out of the countervailing policy would involve us in a long series of very formidable political difficulties. And, of course, the people of this country who reap the advantage of the subsidies would have something decisive to say upon the policy.

Still further it is obvious that if this course of establishing "equality of conditions" is to be properly carried out we could not stop short of using our Customs tariff as a means of fighting Protectionism itself in other countries. It is well known that the effect of high tariffs in such countries, say Germany, France, or the United States, is to keep up artificially home prices of manufactures. Whenever, therefore, the home production exceeds the current demand, the excess does not operate freely upon the home market as it does here. Seeing that the excess is small in comparison with the whole production, it is found more advantageous to sell it abroad at the best prices that can be obtained, even although those may be much below the cost of production. But there is only one great Free Trade market in the world—that of the United Kingdom—where merchandise can always be sold at a price. The effect, therefore, of the Protectionist policy of other nations is to cause an almost constant stream of cheap commodities to be sent to our ports at extremely low prices. But these low prices are possible only because the much higher ones realised in the home markets of the Protectionist countries enable the producers to get rid of their surplus at a loss to themselves. Thus, indirectly, a Protective tariff is the means of conferring a bounty on exports in times of excessive home production. And consequently a thorough and consistent adoption of the countervailing policy involves nothing less than a war with foreign Protection.

"SOLDIERS AND NATIVES."

The *Pioneer* prints the following letter from "Thomas Atkins":—The recent G. O. C. C. directing the report of all assaults by British soldiers upon Natives to the Government of India, Army Headquarters, etc., cuts two ways, viz.:—(1) It protects the poor Native from the strong arm of Thomas Atkins, and (2) it places Thomas Atkins at the mercy of the gentle Native. Take my own case for instance. I am a soldier in staff employ and recently deducted the sum of Rs. 19 from the account of a Native whom I had employed as a contractor, and refused to pay it him until he had made good certain faulty work. As the faulty work in question would cost him more to repair than the sum due to him, he refused to do it, and in revenge brought a false claim against me in the Civil Court for Rs. 100. In cross-examination the plaintiff admitted that he had malice against me, and after hearing the evidence of two of the witnesses for the prosecution the judge dismissed the case as absurd. Not content with this decision the man is taking the case to the Chief Court, and he also threatens to bring another action against me for which he has as much ground as for the former. This places me in an awkward position, either I must submit to be subjected to annoyance and expense in defending these false claims and incur further expense in prosecuting the man for bringing a false charge against me, or I must give him a thrashing to stop his nonsense. If I take the latter course he will no doubt proceed against me for assault in the Civil Court, and, in view of the G. O. C. C. referred to above, I shall also be severely punished by the military authorities. What am I to do? I cannot afford the luxury and expense of legal aid, nor can I afford to lose an eleven years' exemplary character by committing an offence against both civil and military law.

THE CHITRAL RELIEFS.

The deferred Chitral Reliefs will take place in the ordinary course some time during October, the precise date not yet having been fixed. As arranged last spring, the movable column at Khar, which is kept ready equipped with mule transport, will accompany the Relief Force as far as Chakdara, and possibly beyond, if the officer commanding in consultation with the Political Officer considers such a precaution necessary. Reports of a large force being told off to be in immediate readiness, presumably in order to support the reliefs, appear to be generally current, but they are entirely without foundation. As an ordinary measure of precaution a scheme for a reserve column has of course been drawn up beforehand in case the reliefs should be attacked, but this column will only have a paper existence unless the emergency should arise, which there is no reason to anticipate. On the contrary, the country beyond the Malakand frontier is at the present moment absolutely quiet: and there are no grounds whatever for apprehending that there will be any trouble in carrying out the relief movements, though it is quite possible of course that there may be the usual irresponsible "sniping" *en route*.—The *Pioneer*.

LORD SANDHURST'S SUCCESSOR.

The *Pioneer* (September 8) writes: There is a new candidate in the field according to the latest home papers for the succession to Lord Sandhurst at Bombay in the person of Sir Stafford Northcote, second son of the late Lord Iddesleigh, himself best known to the English public during the long years of his parliamentary life by the name and title which this son now carries. It seems to have been given out that Sir Stafford Northcote does not mean to stand for Exeter again: hence it is inferred that he is in the running for a Governorship; and from this it is but a step to conclude that he is destined for the Governorship of Bombay. The character of Sir Stafford Northcote's career makes the suggestion not at all improbable. He has had the training in public affairs that goes to the favoured few who start political life young with all the advantages that can be given them—a clerkship in the Foreign Office, a private secretaryship to the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the Foreign Secretary, then a place or two on his own account, and a safe seat in a neighbourhood where his family influence is paramount. One does not quite know why Sir Stafford Northcote, who is now over fifty, should want to come to Bombay; but in ordinary times if he had the wish he would probably find no difficulty in getting it gratified, and would probably carry on the Government as well as most of his predecessors. But the circumstances are of course very far from being ordinary. By the time Lord Sandhurst quits office it is quite possible that the Province will be in a state that will make it a heavier charge upon the Governor than any province has been since the Mutiny. Plague, famine and all the unmeasured possibilities of sedition and panic—this is not a combination that calls for putting an untried hand at the helm, just to see how he shapes. On the contrary everyone can see that the circumstances call for the highest and most tried capacity that the Government has at its disposal, and it is very fortunate in having at hand a public servant who is peculiarly qualified to meet the emergency, and whom the public opinion of the whole of India looks upon as the necessary man. We have no reason for supposing that Sir Antony MacDonnell desires the Government of Bombay, or even that he would accept if it were offered to him. His four years in the North-West have been a very onerous time, and it would be asking a great deal to require him to go straight from Allahabad next spring to take up a new term of office. But the public will look upon it as little less than a scandal if the offer is not made to him in the first instance: and if the interests of the country were really consulted in the matter the succession would be settled now, so that Sir Antony might be secured at once, while the prospect of getting a few months' holiday before taking over the new task might just turn the scale in favour of his acceptance.

The *Times of India* (September 9) says:—The name of Sir Henry Stafford Northcote is now mentioned as that of one of the likeliest postulants for the Governorship of Bombay. It appeared in that connexion in the home papers for the first time in the week before the mail left, but for some months past Sir Stafford Northcote had been named as one who might have the post if he chose, though more recent information was that he was reluctant to take it, and that in the event of his refusing a choice would be made from the ranks of Indian Civilians. He carries a name that would bespeak friendly acceptance, for no member of the House of Commons was held in more kindly regard than his father, who became Lord Iddesleigh after long years of service to the Conservative party. He himself has had a good deal of varied experience in the less prominent walks of official life, as Secretary to two important special embassies, as Private Secretary to his father when Chancellor of the Exchequer in Lord Beaconsfield's last administration, and as Financial Secretary of the War Office. But he is fifty-three; he would come as a beginner at a time when it is highly important that everyone connected with the Bombay Administration should know his work and fall at once into his place; and we shall not be disappointed if the Crown in its wisdom makes its choice elsewhere.

JUDICIAL AND EXECUTIVE FUNCTIONS.

"An Observer" writes to the *Pioneer* of September 8:—"The evils of the present system in which the same officer unites the executive and judicial functions are no doubt sometimes overdrawn; but one who knows the people of India and their prejudices against the system in vogue must admit that the separation of the two will be decidedly advantageous. It will tend to increase the popularity of the British raj and the people's confidence in its even-handed justice, and it can be effected without any great expenditure of money. The Government has but to unite the civil and executive branches of the Provincial Civil Service, depute a sufficient number of its members to perform executive duties, and vest the rest with both the civil and criminal powers; but, as suggested in your leader of the 21st current, constantly transfer the officers from the executive to the judicial work and *vice versa*, so that there may not arise an occasion for any just rivalry between them. . . . . It cannot be denied that such an arrangement will greatly relieve the magistrates and collectors of control over the subordinate courts, without in any way increasing the work of the judges. It will further check the growth of an unwholesome rivalry between the members of the existing branches of the Provincial Civil Service, and enable the Government to obtain more efficient and experienced men for appointments in the Imperial line. The arrangement is sure to improve and strengthen the administration, and it is idle to say that it will or can in the least impair the prestige of the Government or any of its officers."

SINGER'S SEWING MACHINES.

FOR CASH OR HIRE.

Machines Exchanged and Repaired.

DUPLICATE PARTS, NEEDLES, OIL, &c.,
ALWAYS IN STOCK.

100 Offices in India, Burma, and Ceylon.

Instructions Free. *Price Lists Free on application.*

The SINGER Manufacturing Co. | **5, CHURCH GATE ST., BOMBAY.**

MAHA-BHARATA,

Condensed into English Verse by ROMESH DUTT, C.I.E.

Cheap Edition (*Temple Classics Series*) **Cloth, 1s. 6d., Leather, 2s.**

Edition de Luxe, with an Introduction by the RIGHT HON. PROFESSOR MAX MULLER, and 12 Photogravures from Indian Sources by MISS E. S. HARDY, Cloth 12s. 6d., Parchment 15s. PUBLISHERS, DENT & CO., LONDON.

May be had in India through any Indian bookseller.

OPINIONS.

"The impression which his bold undertaking leaves on the reader is certainly that something like what we here read in English may have been recited in India when the war between the Kurus and the sons of Pandu was first sung by the ancient bards of the country." *Prof. Max Muller's Introduction.*

"Mr. Romesh Chandra Dutt is the first scholar who brings to his task a life-long study of the original, with a perfect command of our own language. . . . Puts into vigorous verse the episodes which are still recited in thousands of quiet hamlets, and hundreds of crowded estivals."—*The Times.*

"An interesting Epilogue by the translator further explains the history and scope of the work, and furnishes an instance of the marvellous command of English acquired by educated Bengali gentlemen. The wisdom of the East is worthily presented in attractive binding and printing."—*The Saturday Review.*

"If the Epic could not attract European readers by its intrinsic merits—its noble moral conceptions, its encyclopædic pictures of Indian civilisation in the remote past, its pathos, its delineation of character—still its extraordinary popularity and influence, as described in the translator's eloquent 'Epilogue,' should alone make us curious to learn something of the story of the Kurus and the God-like sons of Pandu."—*The Manchester Guardian.*

TUITION BY CORRESPONDENCE.

B. C. GHOSH, B.A. (Cantab), Honours in Mathematics and Natural Sciences, M.A. (Allahabad), Government of India State Scholar, Ouseley Scholar School of Modern Oriental Studies, Imperial Institute, formerly lecturer Bareilly Aided College, prepares students for various examinations, Indian and English, *by Correspondence*; and supplies gentlemen in India with information as to courses of study at Cambridge and preparation advisable before coming over to England for the I.C.S. Open Competition. Address St. John's College, Cambridge.

"INDIA," JAN.-JUNE, 1899.

VOL. XI.

NOW READY.

Bound in Cloth (post free) 7/6 each net cash.

The following volumes of "INDIA," bound in cloth, can also be obtained:—

Vols. V. (1894), VI. (1895), VII. (1896), VIII. (1897). Price 8/6 each, post free.
Vols. IX. (Jan.-June, 1898), X. (July-Dec., 1898). Price 7/6 each, post free.
Remittances should accompany order.

Apply to the Manager, "INDIA,"
84 & 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, S.W.

Congress Addresses and Resolutions from the first to 1898.

INDIAN POLITICS.

With an Introduction by W. C. BONNERJEE, Esq., Bar.-at-Law.

Price in India, Rs. 2; in England, 4s. (postage 4d. extra).

PART I.—**Original Articles.**

THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS. EARDLEY NORTON, Esq., Bar.-at-Law.
ECONOMIC CONDITION OF THE PEOPLE OF INDIA. RAO BAHADUR R. N. MUDHOLKAR, B.A., LL.B.
INDIAN ASPIRATIONS UNDER BRITISH RULE. ROMESH CHUNDER DUTT, Esq., C.I.E.
INDIA AND THE CURRENCY QUESTION. DADABHAI NAOROJI, Esq.
THE PERMANENT SETTLEMENT QUESTION. JOHN ADAM, Esq., M.A., Bar.-at-Law.
THE POVERTY OF INDIA. ALFRED NUNDY, Esq., Bar.-at-Law.
LINES OF LEGISLATION IN INDIA. P. S. SIVASWAMY AIYAR, Esq., B.A., B.L.
THE JURY SYSTEM IN INDIA. SORAB PESTONJI N. WADIA, Esq.,
THE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE IN INDIA. V. KRISHNASWAMI AIYAR, Esq., B.A., B.I.
THE STATUS OF INDIANS ABROAD. G. PARAMESWARAN PILLAY, Esq., B.A.
RAILWAYS IN INDIA. G. SUBRAMANIA AIYAR, Esq., B.A.

PART II.—**All the past 13 Congress Presidential Addresses.**
PART III.—**All the past Congress Resolutions.**

In India—Apply to G. A. NATESAN & Co., Publishers, ESPLANADE, MADRAS.
In Great Britain—Apply to The Manager of "INDIA,"
84-85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, S.W.
Remittances must accompany order.

DR. T. N. GHOSE'S

PECTORAL BALSAM.

A BOON TO SUFFERERS FROM ALL DISORDERS AND COMPLAINTS OF THE LUNGS AND CHEST.

For Cold in the Head, Coughs, Hoarseness, Asthma, Hooping Cough, Bronchitis, Sore Throat.

DR. W. VENOR says: "I have used it myself and prescribed it for many patients, and can very strongly recommend it for Bronchitis, Asthma, Indigestion. It will not cure Asthma or Indigestion, but a single dose I have found gives an immediate relief.—31st March, 1889.

P. C. GHOSE & CO., NEW MEDICAL HALL, MEERUT.

is what its name implies **FEVER DESTROYER,**

and Cures Malarious, Intermittent and Remittent types of Fevers, Colds, etc.

North Raglan Barracks, Devonport.
I beg to enclose a cheque for the "Jvara-Hari." Both in India and Africa I have found it the BEST REMEDY FOR FEVER I know
C. E. WOOD, Capt. 22nd North Staffs. Regt.

"Jvara-Hari" is so efficacious on all fevers, that I now indent upon you for 4 dozen, per value payable parcel. I think there is more than magic in it.
G. L. NARSINGA ROW.

For INDIGESTION, DIARRHŒA, CHOLERA, etc., etc.

Cuddalore Municipal Councillors' Office.—"I ave much pleasure in stating that your "Omum-Carpoor" was found very useful for Cholera if taken in the early stage,
C. S. SRINIVASA, Chairman.

Omum-Carpoor
TRADE MARK

Prices of "JVARA-HARI" and "OMUM-CARPOOR" 8 ans., Rs., 1/8 Rs., 2/12 Rs., and 11 Rs. per bottle. N.B.—1 doz. sent post free. To be had of all Chemists and Dealers, or of the Proprietors,

HENRY'S GREAT INDIAN REMEDIES COMPANY, 43, King William St., London, E.C., and 27, Second Line Beach, Madras.

NOTICE TO ADVERTISERS.

Applications for rates for Advertisements in "INDIA," should be made to

THE MANAGER,
84 & 85, Palace Chambers,
Westminster, S.W.

Advertisements should reach the Office not later than first post on Thursday in order to ensure insertion in the issue of the following day.

The annual subscription to INDIA (post free) is nine shillings for England and six rupees for India. Subscriptions are payable in advance. Remittances, or communications relating to subscriptions or any other matter of business connected with INDIA, should in all cases be sent to the MANAGER *of INDIA, 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, London, S.W. In any communication regarding copies of INDIA circulated in India, it is requested that Subscribers be referred to both by name and by the number printed in each case upon the addressed wrapper.*

Cheques and Post Office Orders payable to W. DOUGLAS HALL.

Copies of INDIA can be obtained from the Offices of the Paper; from MR. ELLIOT STOCK, *Paternoster Row, London, E.C.; and to order at any Railway Bookstall.*

Printed by A. BONNER, 1 & 2, Took's Court, London, E.C., and Published for the Proprietors at 84 & 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.